R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 013 866 UD 004 369

VANGUARD OF EDUCATION IN TEXAS.
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY, AUSTIN

PUB DATE MAY 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.72 18P.

DESCRIPTORS- *FEDERAL PROGRAMS, PROGRAM EVALUATION, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, IDENTIFICATION, SCHOOL DISTRICTS, PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, OBJECTIVES, PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS, BASIC SKILLS, STUDENT IMPROVEMENT, INNOVATION, SCHOOL PERSONNEL, STUDENT ATTITUDES, LANGUAGE SKILLS, *SCHOOL SERVICES, TABLES (DATA), ESEA TITLE I, TEXAS

THIS BRIEF REPORT SUMMARIZES THE ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT (1966) OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT TITLE I PROJECTS IN 1,133 LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN TEXAS. IT BRIEFLY OUTLINES THE CRITERIA AND METHODS USED THROUGHOUT THE STATE TO IDENTIFY EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED YOUNGSTERS. IN GENERAL THE INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS CONCENTRATED ON IMPROVING BASIC SKILLS, ENRICHMENT, HEALTH AND WELFARE SERVICES, ATTITUDE CHANGE, TEACHER EDUCATION, GUIDANCE, ADDITIONAL EQUIPMENT AND MATERIALS, AND PARENT INVOLVEMENT. MUCH OF THE INFORMATION ABOUT THESE OBJECTIVES IS SUMMARIZED IN TABLES, WHICH ALSO PROVIDE GENERAL STATISTICAL INFORMATION, AND DATA ON PROJECTS INVOLVING COOPERATION BETWEEN SCHOOL DISTRICTS, ON INNOVATIVE ACTIVITIES AND SERVICES, AND ON STAFF POSITIONS. STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS WERE THE MAIN INSTRUMENTS USED TO MEASURE PROJECT EFFECTIVENESS. PARTICIPATING DISTRICTS REPORTED "SOME EVIDENCE" OF PUPIL GROWTH IN SEVERAL AREAS, THE GREATEST IN INCREASED INTEREST IN SCHOOL AND IMPROVED ATTITUDES. THE LEAST IMPROVEMENT WAS IN ORAL ENGLISH. THE MAJOR PROGRAM PROBLEM WAS LATE ARRIVAL OF MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT. (NH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

UD004369
04369

ED013866

Vanguard of Education in Texas

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
AUSTIN, TEXAS
MAY 1967

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Participation in Title I	2
General	2
Cooperative Projects	3
Non-Public Schools	3
Title I Participants	4
Identification of the Educationally Deprived Children	4
Identified Needs	5
Activities and Services	6
Objectives	6
Effective Activities and Services	7
Innovative Activities and Services	7
Staff Positions Added	10
General Analysis of Effectiveness of Title I	12
Evidences of Success	12
Problems	13
Conclusion	14

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Statistical Information: General.	2
2	Activities and Services: Number of Projects and Pupils Participating As Stated in Evaluation Reports.	2
3	Cooperative Projects	3
4	Participation of Non-Public Schools and Pupils	3
5	Criteria for Identifying Educationally Deprived Children As Stated in Project Proposals	4
6	Means of Identifying Educationally Deprived Children As Stated in Project Proposals	5
7	Rank Order of Statements of Pupil Needs As Stated in Project Proposals	5
8	Objectives of Title I Projects As Stated in Evaluation Reports.	6
9	Effective Activities and Services, By Grade Span	7
10	Staff Positions Proposed and Added in Title I Projects . . .	10
11	Evidences of Pupil Growth As Stated in Evaluation Reports.	12
12	Administrative Problems in Local School Districts As Stated in Evaluation Reports.	13

INTRODUCTION

The passage and appropriation of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 made available $78,103,938 to eligible public school districts in Texas. About 86 percent of the 1322 public school districts in Texas were allocated Title I funds to conduct programs during the 1965-66 school year and the summer.

The evaluation of Title I's impact on the educationally deprived children of Texas proved to be an enormous task. A special Evaluation Section was established as part of the Division of Compensatory Education to direct the evaluation efforts for the State. In addition, a special Task Force composed of Texas Education Agency staff members, representatives of the Research and Development Center of the University of Texas, and some school officials from the Austin Independent School District assisted the Evaluation Section in the formulation of state guidelines.

Utilizing suggestions of the Task Force, the Texas Education Agency published the Guidelines for Evaluation of Special Programs for Educationally Deprived Children under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in March 1966. This publication became the basis for the development of evaluation procedures by the local school districts.

This report is a summary of Volume I of the Annual Evaluation Report of Special Programs for Educationally Deprived Children under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which was submitted to the United States Office of Education. The complete report assimilated information from project proposals of the local school districts, evaluation reports from participating school districts, observations of Texas Education Agency staff members, and contracted evaluations. For those who may wish to study the full report, copies may be obtained on a loan basis from the Research Library of the Texas Education Agency.

PARTICIPATION IN TITLE I

GENERAL

The scope of Title I can be seen from the information in Tables 1 and 2. Table 1 shows a general breakdown of the entire compensatory effort. Table 2 reveals participation in the various activities and services which Texas schoolmen thought would best meet the needs of the educationally deprived children. Of the participants, 22,355 were in preschool, 254,945 in grades 1-6, and 137,711 in grades 7-12.

Table 1

STATISTICAL INFORMATION: GENERAL

Number of LEAs approved	1,133
Maximum Entitlement to LEAs approved	$74,343,895
Total Funds Approved	$73,264,125
Total Funds Expended	$65,260,201
UNDUPLICATED COUNT OF CHILDREN	
Public	379,731
Non-Public	9,659
Not Enrolled	25,621
Total: Public, Non-Public and Not Enrolled	415,011
Average per Pupil Cost	$ 158.17

Table 2

ACTIVITIES AND SERVICES: NUMBER OF PROJECTS AND PUPILS PARTICIPATING
As Stated in Evaluation Reports

Activity or Service	Number of Projects	Number of Pupils
Reading	522	191,183
Health, Medical, and Welfare	335	400,012
Library Services	210	244,295
Language Arts	153	73,727
Reading-Language Arts Combination	139	127,635
Home Visitations	123	---
Instructional Media	123	---
Guidance and Counseling	121	144,162
Inservice	111	---
Preschool (Regular Term)	94	10,222
Physical Education	73	94,423
Study and Recreation Centers	62	68,704
Fine Arts	54	61,019
Mathematics	48	35,269
Enrichment Experiences	35	109,601
Science	20	69,732
Instruction for Non-English Speaking Children	15	6,506
Special Education	14	1,390
Social Studies	10	41,861

COOPERATIVE PROJECTS

Local school districts with entitlements of less than $10,000 and with fewer than twelve grades were permitted to participate in Title I only if they joined with at least one other district in a cooperative project. While the number of member districts in cooperative projects varied from two to eleven, the average number was three (3) districts. The statistical information for cooperative projects is presented in Table 3.

Table 3

COOPERATIVE PROJECTS

Total Number of Cooperative Projects	151
Number of School Districts	474
Amount of Funds Approved	$12,197,706.22
Public School Participants	64,777
Non-Public School Participants	828
Total Participants	65,605

NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Public Law 89-10 provides for the inclusion of non-public school children in the programs of Title I. The responsibility for determining eligible students, planning activities and services, implementing the activities, and evaluating outcomes is left to the local public school officials. Representatives of non-public schools were invited to participate in the ten regional workshops conducted in September of 1965. At these workshops it was emphasized that public school officials were required to take the initiative in contacting non-public school officials. Table 4 presents data for the participation of non-public schools and students in non-public schools.

Table 4

PARTICIPATION OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND PUPILS

Public School Districts with:	No. of Districts	No. of Non-Public Children
Non-public schools in the district not participating	61	
Non-public schools participating during regular school year only	38	2,682
Non-public schools participating during summer only	15	884
Non-public schools participating during both regular school year and summer	47	12,393
TOTAL	161	15,959

TITLE I PARTICIPANTS

IDENTIFICATION OF THE EDUCATIONALLY DEPRIVED CHILDREN

Allocation of Title I funds to school districts was based on the number of children in families with incomes of $2,000 or less using the 1960 U.S. Bureau of Census statistics. However, justification for Title I projects was based on identified educational needs of children within the economically deprived attendance areas. Local school districts were asked to develop plans for identifying the educationally deprived children in this area. The project proposals from the schools revealed a dozen criteria which seemed to characterize the identification process. The percentage of schools using each of these 12 criteria is indicated in Table 5. After the selection of criteria for identification, schools selected instruments, tests, and techniques for obtaining supportive data. Table 6 illustrates the percentage of schools using the various approaches for identification of educationally deprived children.

Table 5

CRITERIA FOR IDENTIFYING EDUCATIONALLY DEPRIVED CHILDREN
As Stated in Project Proposals

Item Description	State Percentage
Inability to pay for school lunches	53%
One or more grade levels below age-grade norms on standardized tests	52%
Pattern of failing grades	41%
High frequency of absences	40%
Inability to pay school fees and buy supplies	39%
Retained one grade level or more	39%
Inadequacies in speaking and understanding English	38%
Low annual per capita family income	35%
Family on welfare support	32%
Dropouts (potential and actual)	27%
Physically handicapped or educable mentally retarded	20%
Limited environment and substandard home situation	17%

Table 6

MEANS OF IDENTIFYING EDUCATIONALLY DEPRIVED CHILDREN
As Stated in Project Proposals

Item Description	State Percentage
Tests (largely standardized achievement tests)	65%
Personal observation and knowledge of children by teachers, principals, and others	59%
School records (largely permanent records)	40%
Survey questionnaires, checklists	24%
Public records (welfare, court, public health)	20%
Attendance records	18%
1960 Census records	13%

IDENTIFIED NEEDS

From the identification processes, a pattern of needs for educationally deprived children emerged. Each district had its own peculiar pattern, but five (5) rather distinct needs seemed to be common throughout Texas. Table 7 presents a rank order of those needs as reported in the project proposals.

Table 7

RANK ORDER OF STATEMENTS OF PUPIL NEEDS
As Stated in Project Proposals

1. Poor reading skills
2. Inadequate use of English language
3. Weaknesses in school environment (largely lack of learning materials)
4. Home environment which does not provide background of experiences
5. Poor conditions of health, nutrition, clothing and supplies

ACTIVITIES AND SERVICES

OBJECTIVES

After the identification of needs, determination of eligibility for participation, and a consideration of existing programs, school districts were in a position to formulate objectives for a project and design activities and services to reach the objectives. The objectives of Title I projects with the percentage of schools stating each in the evaluation reports are given in Table 8.

Table 8

OBJECTIVES OF TITLE I PROJECTS
As Stated in Evaluation Reports

Item Description	State Percentage
Improve Reading	70%
Encourage Interest in School (Better Attitudes)	32%
Provide Modern Teaching Equipment, Materials, and Techniques	31%
Improve Command of Spoken English	29%
Improve Language Arts Skills	27%
Improve Attendance	23%
Provide Free Lunches	22%
Provide Health and Welfare Services	22%
Provide Health Services and Examinations	21%
Improve Home-School Relations	20%
Raise Self-Image and Social Concepts	20%
Relieve Teachers of Nonprofessional Duties (Aides)	20%
Increase Inservice for Teachers	19%
Improve Teacher Understanding and Methods with Educationally Deprived Children	19%
Improve Ability to Communicate Ideas, Information, and Directions	18%
Expand Library Services	17%
Provide Enrichment Experiences	17%
Encourage Reading for Information and Pleasure	16%
Extend Guidance and Counseling Services	15%
Acquire Additional Equipment, Materials, and Facilities	14%
Assist Students in Social Adjustment	14%
Improve School Environment and Teacher Competency	14%
Increase Parental Involvement and Interest	13%
Provide Health Instruction	12%
Improve Math Skills	12%
Provide Needed Clothing and Shoes	11%

EFFECTIVE ACTIVITIES AND SERVICES

Schools were interested in knowing which of the activities and services proved to be most effective in producing desired pupil changes in behavior. Reports from the schools revealed a variety of effective measures, but a pattern of consistently effective activities and services for the early years, the middle years, and the teen years was noted. A rank order listing of the effective activities and services is shown in Table 9.

Table 9

EFFECTIVE ACTIVITIES AND SERVICES, BY GRADE SPAN

Early Years (Preschool-Grade 3)	Middle Years (Grades 4-6)	Teen Years (Grades 7-12)
Health and Welfare	Reading Instruction	Counseling
Cultural Enrichment	Counseling	Cultural Enrichment
Oral Language Development	Physical Education	Library Services
Home Visitations	Library Services	Physical Education
Reading Instruction	Health and Welfare	Tutoring

INNOVATIVE ACTIVITIES AND SERVICES

With the addition of Title I funds and some direct encouragement from the United States Office of Education, several developments occurred which were innovations for public education in Texas. Some of these innovations were of such nature that a brief statement concerning them is in order. More information concerning the projects mentioned can be obtained from the school districts listed.

Reading Instruction

San Angelo (Tom Green County): A special class of eighth grade students taught by a reading teacher and counselor. Group sessions on study skills, why study, educational and vocational plans, and personal concerns in addition to reading instruction.

Austin (Travis County): Primary and intermediate remedial reading team teachers--special teacher worked with retarded group, while the regular teacher worked with other children. The children experienced success for the first time and talked more freely in classroom discussions.

New Braunfels (Comal County): Field trips taken to correlate with vocabulary building and to provide meaningful experiences to students.

Merkel (Taylor County): Students allowed to use library during holidays. Counseling services coordinated with the Remedial Reading Clinic to encourage students to expand career goals and continue education.

Wills Point (Van Zandt County): On the preschool level, two visiting teachers went into each child's home twice each week. Teachers carried filmstrips, picture story books, and show-and-tell machines to the home.

Northeast (Bexar County): Mobile remedial reading centers purchased to serve all area-of-concentration schools in the district.

Rule (Haskell County): Title I stamps placed inside the front cover of books indicate the reading level. Stamp is in the form of a clock face with hours comparable to grade levels-an arrow pointing to 2 o'clock indicates second grade reading level. The teacher may select the proper books for a pupil without embarrassing a teenager who reads at the third grade level.

Goose Creek (Harris County): Students taught to spell, count, and identify letters of the alphabet through music. They see a bee, touch it, hear it humming, and then play it on a musical instrument--b,e,e. One seven-year-old, considered to be unteachable, learned to spell by associating the order of musical notes with the order of the alphabet. He had learned left to right perspective from reading music.

Lufkin (Angelina County): Program was a blend of individualized and group work. Rhythm band instruments were used experimentally with poor readers.

Cultural Enrichment Activities

Liberty Hill (Williamson County): Experiences aimed toward broadening the occupational knowledge of high school seniors. Activities designed to develop an appreciation of the fine arts, learning and practicing social graces, and attaining a respect for law and order. Field trips based upon planned pre-study and followed by evaluative discussions included visiting a hospital with emphasis on nursing as a profession, an air terminal, a cafeteria and shopping center, and the State Department of Public Safety.

Use of Visual Aids and Instructional Materials

Center (Shelby County): Materials Center contained rooms for inservice which was conducted weekly; a media specialist trained at Camp Gary was available to make transparencies, prepare tapes, and develop films. New equipment and instructional materials arrived at the center where they were processed and delivered to Title I schools.

Edinburg-Brownsville-Harlingen (Hidalgo and Cameron Counties): A tri-city media center established to serve these school districts.

Use of Teacher Aides

Sinton (San Patricio County): Bilingual aides in preschool program for bilingual children.

Marble Falls (Burnet County): A teacher aide hired to assist each professional teacher in clerical tasks and other useful ways. Aides visited in the home to get firsthand information about living conditions and family background.

Health and Physical Education

Port Arthur (Jefferson County): Provision for physical, psychological, psychiatric, and neurological examinations at the elementary level.

Pharr-San Juan-Alamo (Hidalgo County): Health literature in Spanish sent to parents.

Sinton (San Patricio County): Sanitary Facility Center to provide for care of minor health problems and instruction to adults about sanitation.

Parental Involvement and Visiting Teacher Services

La Vega (McLennan County): A liaison worker was responsible for obtaining information necessary for evaluating the needs of a student or his family. Referrals were made to the Salvation Army, Goodwill Industries, and to the McLennan County Welfare Department.

Guidance and Counseling Services

Northeast Houston (Harris County): Guidance services provided to pupils and their parents after school hours, during the evenings, and on weekends. Identification of potential dropouts and encouragement for them to stay in school was a basic objective. Dropout rate decreased in project schools from five percent in 1964-65 to four percent in 1965-66.

Austin (Travis County): Sixteen successful teachers trained to be elementary counselors through intensive inservice. Basic responsibility was to act as consultant to teachers in interpreting test results and diagnosing learning difficulties. Also made appropriate referrals and did individual counseling with children.

Preschool Readiness Instruction and Services

Laredo (Webb County): A preschool bilingual program was conducted on 17 successive Saturday mornings for over 700 children. Emphasis was placed upon the health and nutritional needs of these children as well as their improvement in speaking English. Tuberculin tests, immunizations, general medical examinations, and dental examinations were administered to these children.

Programs in the Fine Arts

Houston (Harris County): Special teachers taught classes in music to students during the summer program. Concerts and art exhibits were held.

Sinton (San Patricio County): An Instrumental Music and Art Development Service was established for grades 1-3 in which musical instruments, art materials and instruction were provided. Public appearances at local service organizations, such as the Lions, Rotary, and Kiwanis Clubs, were made by several groups.

Other Innovative Projects

Cotulla (La Salle County): A "no-bell" system was initiated. There were several remedial as well as physical education and craft classes going on at the same time. A child was free to go from one class to another as he wished without restriction. This was in summer school only.

Houston (Harris County): Instruction was given in Spanish Shorthand. Students to become bilingual secretaries.

Crockett (Houston County): At an elementary school located in a swampy area of the community, the school grounds were drained and landscaped, and covered concrete walkways were provided. New restroom facilities were also added.

Program Evaluation

Several innovative approaches for evaluating Title I programs were employed by local districts.

South Park (Jefferson County): A color movie was produced, reviewing aspects of their Title I project. The film was made in the district's own media processing center.

Dickinson (Galveston County): A set of color slides of children and activities was produced, and a copy presented to the Division of Compensatory Education as part of the evaluation report.

Groesbeck (Limestone County): A taped evaluation discussion by the faculty of the Title I project was made and included as part of the annual evaluation report.

Cotulla (La Salle County): On a pre-post basis, school officials made movies of children participating in activities in their Title I program. Particularly good coverage was made of the physical fitness aspect of the project.

STAFF POSITIONS ADDED

School districts requested the addition of new faculty and staff members to conduct Title I activities and services. Table 10 shows the number of personnel requested and the number actually added; a discrepancy between these two numbers indicates a shortage of qualified personnel. Because of this shortage of qualified personnel, teaching positions remained unfilled in the areas of reading, language arts, music, art, and special education. Other significant staff shortages occurred with counselors, visiting teachers, librarians, nurses, social workers, program administrators or supervisors, and other educational specialists.

Table 10

STAFF POSITIONS PROPOSED AND ADDED IN TITLE I PROJECTS
(Based on Representative Sample of 222 Projects)

Position	Number Proposed	Number Added
Teacher Aides	1882	1873
Reading Teachers	630	538
Teachers (area not specified)	599	583
Language Arts Teachers	277	246
Preschool Teachers	247	225
Tutors	191	96
Reading-Language Arts Combination Teachers	181	143
Librarians	175	149
Nurses	158	140
Counselors	144	43
Library Aides	140	134
Physical Education Teachers	137	123
Clerks	113	104
Specialists (curriculum or other)	106	82
Secretaries	103	101
Visiting Teachers	84	55
Supervisors or Program Directors	65	45

STAFF POSITIONS PROPOSED AND ADDED IN TITLE I PROJECTS (CONT'D)

Position	Number Proposed	Number Added
Music Teachers	53	38
Instructional Media Aides	47	16
Teachers (combined teaching areas)	38	16
Consultants	33	25
Attendance Workers	32	30
Art Teachers	30	18
Cafeteria Aides	29	28
Social Workers	28	18
Teachers for Study Center	21	2
Bus Drivers	16	8
Special Education Teachers	11	5
Psychologists	10	9
Psychometrists	8	5
Physicians	6	5
Math Teachers	6	3
Speech Therapists	6	2
Science Teachers	4	1
Drivers, Mobile Unit	4	3
Speech Teachers	2	0

GENERAL ANALYSIS OF EFFECTIVENESS OF TITLE I

EVIDENCES OF SUCCESS

In order to judge the effectiveness of Title I projects in local school districts and in the State as a whole, it was necessary to collect evidence of pupil growth or progress toward stated objectives. Standardized achievement tests were the mainstay of measurement instruments used by most school districts in assessing progress toward stated objectives. In addition to these, a number of techniques were used to gather information about levels of pupil development. Several districts used case histories and anecdotal records; others used photographs, movies, and tapes to record behavior and make judgments concerning progress. Informal checklists and questionnaires were used by many teachers. Evaluation reports from participating districts presented some evidence to support pupil growth in a number of dimensions. Table 11 shows these dimensions and the percentage of districts reporting growth in each.

Table 11

EVIDENCES OF PUPIL GROWTH
As Stated in Evaluation Reports

Item	State Percentage
Increased Interest in School and Better Attitudes	65%
Improved Reading Skills	63%
Improved Attendance	46%
Better General Health	35%
Increased Reading for Information and Pleasure	32%
More Positive Self-Image and Social Concepts	32%
Improved Overall Achievement	30%
Improved Social Adjustment of Pupils	27%
Resolution of Social and Behavioral Problems	17%
Better Ability to Communicate Ideas and Information	14%
Improved Language Arts Skills	14%
Improved Command of Spoken English	13%

In addition to the reports of progress on the part of the pupils toward educational objectives, numerous school districts reported that the Title I program was accepted and supported by pupils, parents, and school staff. Many school districts were well pleased with the development of professional staff members through inservice. Consultants from colleges, universities, and the Texas Education Agency were asked in many cases to assist with program planning, inservice training, and evaluation.

As was to be expected, the addition of new staff members and the use of a wide variety of materials, supplies, library books, and audio-visual equipment were reported to be highly effective in the school program.

PROBLEMS

The advent of a program with the scope of Title I was a new experience for all districts, and problems did occur. Most of the problems centered around the late date at which funds, guidelines, and planning assistance were made available to the districts. Table 12 shows the percentage of schools reporting the various problems.

Table 12

ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS IN LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS
As Stated in Evaluation Reports

Item Description	State Percentage
Late Arrival of Materials and Equipment	55%
Qualified Personnel Not Available	44%
Program Enacted Too Late to Produce Desired Results	32%
Inadequate Facilities	31%
Selecting and Obtaining Appropriate Materials	27%
Selection of Pupils for Participation	22%
Insufficient Training for Professional Staff	20%

CONCLUSION

Much has been accomplished, although in many cases only a beginning has been made. Success was not achieved with every educationally deprived pupil. Many children, particularly those already in their teens, were difficult to reach. It was not easy for them to change strongly conditioned behavioral patterns--both cognitive and affective. It is anticipated that with more time, with further opportunities to try new approaches and evaluate them, with increased staff competencies through inservice, and with broader opportunities for pupils to learn through interacting with each other, continued progress will be made in providing learning opportunities, in expanding experiential background, in raising achievement levels, and in developing wholesome attitudes and interests of educationally deprived children.